



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/054,539	10/25/2001	Benjamin J. Parker	1687 (15722)	5974

33272 7590 02/23/2005

SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY L.P.  
6391 SPRINT PARKWAY  
MAILSTOP: KSOPHT0101-22100  
OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100

EXAMINER
----------

STRANGE, AARON N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2153

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/054,539	<b>Applicant(s)</b> PARKER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Aaron Strange	<b>Art Unit</b> 2153	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10/25/01 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                         |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                                                   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                                          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10252001</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                                |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

3. With regard to claim 1, it is unclear what Applicant intends to claim. The preamble states that the claim refers to a network apparatus, but goes on to claim a plurality of components. Figure 1 suggests that these are discrete elements that are not located in a single apparatus.

4. With regard to claim 1, the limitation "determining if said nominal destination should be redirected" (Page 9, Lines 20-21) is unclear. It is unclear how the destination may be redirected. The Examiner recommends that the claim be amended to recite "determining if said user traffic should be redirected" or a similar recitation. Claim 8 contains a similar recitation (Page 10, Lines 31-32).

5. With regard to claim 1, the limitation "a respective numerical network address to redirect according to said respective logical name" (Page 9, Lines 25-26) is unclear. It is

Art Unit: 2153

unclear how the address may be redirected. The Examiner recommends that the claim be amended to recite "querying said address server for a respective numerical network address, corresponding to said respective logical name, to redirect the traffic to." or a similar recitation.

6. All claims not individually rejected are rejected by virtue of their dependency from the above claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-3,8,10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhang et al. (US 6,119,160) in view of RAD Data Communications.

9. With regard to claim 1, Zhang discloses a network apparatus comprising: a plurality of service-option resources (Col 5, Lines 44-50 and Fig 1, 14 &16) each having a respective numerical network address (IP address); an authorization server storing respective user profiles for identifying service-option resources to which each one of a plurality of users are authorized to use (AAA server) (Col 4, Lines 19-26); and a plurality

Art Unit: 2153

of service selection gateways (Fig 1, 122, 144) coupled said service-option resources, said address server, and said authorization server, each service selection gateway: receiving user traffic from a respective user directed to a nominal destination (service login request) (Col 4, Lines 56-58), determining if said nominal destination should be redirected to one of said service-option resources in response to a respective user profile (determine if access is authorized) (Col 5, Lines 6-12).

Zhang fails to specifically disclose an address server storing said numerical network addresses and a respective logical name corresponding to each numerical network address, said address server responding to queries by providing a numerical network address corresponding to a logical name contained in a respective query or querying said address server for a respective numerical network address to redirect according to said respective logical name.

RAD Data Communications discloses a well-known system for translating logical names into numerical addresses. RAD discloses an address server storing said numerical network addresses (IP address) (Page 2) and a respective logical name corresponding to each numerical network address (domain name) (Page 3). The address server responds to queries by providing a numerical network address corresponding to a logical name contained in a query (Pages 7-8). Using this system to query for a numerical address corresponding to the logical name of the appropriate service-option resource would have been an advantageous addition to the system disclosed by Zhang. This system would have allowed the service-option resources to be referred to by a hostname in the service selection gateway, making it easier for

administrators to remember the names of the available resources when configuring the gateways. Additionally, changes in the IP address of the service-option resources would be handled by the DNS system, and would not require reconfiguration at the service selection gateway.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use logical names to refer to the service-option resources and resolve them into IP addresses using the DNS system disclosed by RAD. This would have made it easier for administrators to remember the names of the available resources when configuring the gateways and eliminated reconfiguration of the service selection gateway when the IP address of the service-option resources changed.

10. With regard to claims 2 and 10, RAD Data Communications further discloses that said numerical network addressers are comprised of IP addresses (Page 2).

11. With regard to claims 3 and 11, Zhang further discloses that said service-option resources include subscription services and wherein said network apparatus further comprises a service selection dashboard through which said users obtain authorization for said subscription services (Col 3, Lines 64-66).

12. With regard to claim 8, Zhang discloses a method of forwarding user traffic in a computer network including a plurality of service-option resources each having a respective numerical network address (IP address), said method comprising the steps

of: storing respective user profiles for identifying service-option resources to which each one of a plurality of users are authorized to use (Col 4, Lines 19-26); receiving at a service selection gateway user traffic from a user in the form of a packet having a nominal destination (service login request) (Col 4, Lines 56-58); determining where said nominal destination should be redirected in response to respective user profile (determine if access is authorized) (Col 5, Lines 6-12); and said service selection gateway redirecting said packet to said respective numerical network address (user is connected to service) (Col 5, Lines 44-50).

Zhang fails to specifically disclose an address server storing said numerical network addresses and a respective logical name corresponding to each numerical network address, said address server responding to queries by providing a numerical network address corresponding to a logical name contained in a respective query or querying said address server for a respective numerical network address to redirect according to said respective logical name.

RAD Data Communications discloses a well-known system for translating logical names into numerical addresses. RAD discloses an address server storing said numerical network addresses (IP address) (Page 2) and a respective logical name corresponding to each numerical network address (domain name) (Page 3). The address server responds to queries by providing a numerical network address corresponding to a logical name contained in a query (Pages 7-8). Using this system to query for a numerical address corresponding to the logical name of the appropriate service-option resource would have been an advantageous addition to the system

Art Unit: 2153

disclosed by Zhang. This system would have allowed the service-option resources to be referred to by a hostname in the service selection gateway, making it easier for administrators to remember the names of the available resources when configuring the gateways. Additionally, changes in the IP address of the service-option resources would be handled by the DNS system, and would not require reconfiguration at the service selection gateway.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use logical names to refer to the service-option resources and resolve them into IP addresses using the DNS system disclosed by RAD. This would have made it easier for administrators to remember the names of the available resources when configuring the gateways and eliminated reconfiguration of the service selection gateway when the IP address of the service-option resources changed.

13. Claims 4-6 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhang et al. (US 6,119,160) in view of RAD Data Communications in further view of Li et al. (US 6,119,165).

14. With regard to claims 4-6 and 12-14, while the system disclosed by Zhang in view of RAD Data Communications shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose that said service option resources include at least

Art Unit: 2153

one firewall resource, at least one virus scanning resource, or at least one content-filtering resource.

Li teaches a system where client requests are passed through a proxy server that provides various services to the client. Li discloses that the services include firewall service, virus scanning service, and content filtering service (Col 5, Lines 5-23). These services are well known in the art and provide enhanced security to users of the system. They would have been an advantageous addition to the system disclosed by Zhang in view of RAD Data Communications since they would have allowed the users to utilize them in order to block viruses, objectionable content, and network attacks from outside the firewall.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide firewall service, virus scanning service, and/or content filtering service to the users of the system since it would have allowed the users to block viruses, objectionable content, and network attacks from outside the firewall.

15. Claims 7 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhang et al. (US 6,119,160) in view of RAD Data Communications in further view of Brown et al. (US 6,732,179).

16. With regard to claims 7 and 15, while the system disclosed by Zhang in view of RAD Data Communications shows substantial features of the claimed invention

Art Unit: 2153

(discussed above), it fails to disclose that said service option resources include at least one walled-garden resource.

Brown teaches the use of walled-garden resources to provide controlled access to network-based services such as newspapers, music, video, and stock prices (Col 7, Line 41 to Col 8, Line 14). This allows the content provides to sell subscriptions to the services in the walled garden and keep unauthorized users from accessing the services (Col 14, Lines 1-26).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use walled-garden resources in the system disclosed by Zhang in view of RAD Data Communications since it would have allowed content providers to sell subscriptions to the services in the walled garden and keep unauthorized users from accessing the services.

17. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhang et al. (US 6,119,160) in view of RAD Data Communications in further view of Bero (US 6,769,031).

18. With regard to claim 9, while the system disclosed by Zhang in view of RAD Data Communications shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose reconfiguring said service-option resources, resulting in changed numerical network addresses; and modifying said stored numerical network addresses on said address server; whereby said service selection gateway continues to redirect

said packets to a correct numerical network address after said reconfiguring step without requiring any changes to said service selection gateway.

Bero teaches a method of updating a DNS server when the IP address of a server changes. This allows the DNS server to maintain the correct mapping between the logical hostname and the current IP address of the server (Col 9, Line 63 to Col 10, Line 19). This way, any clients attempting to access the server do not have to make any changes in order to access the server since the DNS server will return the new IP address when a resolution request is made.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the method taught by Bero to update the DNS server whenever the IP address of a service-option resource changes in the system taught by Zhang and RAD. This would have allowed the service selection gateway to properly redirect the packets without making any changes.

### ***Conclusion***

19. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aaron Strange whose telephone number is 571-272-3959. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

Art Unit: 2153

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess can be reached on 571-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AS



GLEN B. BURGESS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100